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Thank you for an expedite review process and for the very helpful comments from both referees. Please find below a detailed account of the changes made in response to the reviewer comments. We hope that with the amendments made, our manuscript fulfills the requirements for publication in BMC Oral Health

Sincerely yours

Rodrigo Lopez
Reviewer 1.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1) Consequences of transformation of the original 5-point Liker-like scale into a dichotomous yes/no scale:
We have now discussed the implications of this on page 11. We could indeed provide a 5-point Likert-like scale in Spanish, but we don’t see the point in the context of our study.

2) Choice of recall period:
The implications of this are discussed on page 11.

3) Figures could be deleted and confidence intervals added to table 3.
Done.

4) Attachment loss > 1 mm could be excluded:
Yes, but we would like to keep it. We find it interesting that even an apparently clinically irrelevant severity is reflected by the instrument.

5) Confidence intervals for Cronbach’s alpha… explain the calculation of the average inter-item correlations:
One sided confidence intervals have been added. Calculations are now described in page 8.

6) Delete Table 1
Done. Relevant information is provided in page 8.

7) In translation … did any words change considerably…
No. We have added a paragraph to this effect on pages 10-11.

8) Move “oral health outcomes” to “discriminative validity”
9) Clarify why some items could be rare while the domain showed high impact...
Two items in the domain ‘functional limitation’, one relating to food digestion and one to the use of prostheses, were rather infrequent as one would expect for a young population. Nevertheless, the score for the whole ‘functional limitation’ domain was high due to the frequent occurrence of other items. This has been explained in page 12.

10) The abstract could be improved..
The reviewer’s suggestions were all complied with.

Reviewer 2.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1) Because of the importance of the translation process a paragraph in the discussion should be devoted to it.
We agree, and have added a paragraph in pages 10-11.

2) … the OHIP would probably perform equally well (or even better) ..... in populations with a larger disease burden.
We agree, and have addressed this in pages 13-14.

3) The authors may consider dropping the first sentences of conclusion
Done.

4) The authors changed the response format of the instrument...
Yes, we have addressed the implications of this (see response to reviewer 1, point 1)
5) The instrument format change may have reduced the reliability estimates…
We have discussed the implications in pages 11, 13, and 14.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Validity assessment results could be compared …
Done.

2) Drop Table 1
Done.

3) Drop graphs
Done.

4) ROC area interpretations
We have added comments to this effect on page 7.

5) Cronbach’s alpha…could need further explanation for the reader who is not experienced…
We have added a section as recommended in page 8.

6) The second to last sentence in the methods would benefit from change
Done.

7) Last sentence in Methods should be dropped.
Done.

8) Before giving the acronym CAL in abstract ….
Corrected.